15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
8		
9	PETER PAIZ,	
10	Plaintiff, No. C 09-02576 JSW	
11	v.	
12	CHASE, et al., ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE	
13	Defendants.	
14		

Upon reviewing the Amended Complaint in this matter, it appears as though Venue is not proper in the Northern District of California. Instead, venue appears to be proper in the Eastern District of California. A civil action in which jurisdiction is premised on federal question may be brought only in a judicial district (1) where any defendant resides, if all defendants reside in the same State, (2) in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of the property that is the subject of the action is situated, or (3) in which any defendant may be found, if there is no district in which the action may otherwise be brought. 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b). If venue is improper, a district court has discretion to either dismiss the action, or in the interest of justice, transfer the action to a district in which it could have been brought. 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a).

According the Amended Complaint, only one of the named defendants resides in California, and none of the named defendants appear to reside in the Northern District. Therefore, venue would not be proper in the Northern District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b)(1) or (b)(3). Moreover, the property that is the subject of this action is situated in the

Case 3:09-cv-02576-JSW Document 9 Filed 07/14/09 Page 2 of 3

United States District Court

For the Northern District of California

Eastern District, not the Northern District. Accordingly, venue would not be proper in the		
Northern District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(1	b)(2). Thus, the Court HEREBY ORDERS	
Plaintiff Peter Paiz to Show Cause in writing by	no later than July 22, 2009 why this action	
should not be transferred to the Eastern District of California, the district in which the property		
that is the subject of this action is situated.		
IT IS SO ORDERED.		
Dated: July 14, 2009	JEFFREY S. WHITE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 2 FOR THE 3 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 4 5 PETER PAIZ, Case Number: CV09-02576 JSW 6 Plaintiff. CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 7 v. 8 CHASE et al, 9 Defendant. 10 11 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California. 12 That on July 14, 2009, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing 13 said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office 14 delivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office. 15 16 Peter Paiz 17 1830 Avenida Martina Roseville, CA 95747 18 nnyer Ottolini 19 Dated: July 14, 2009 20 Richard W. Wieking, Clerk By: Jennifer Ottolini, Deputy Clerk 21 22 23 24 25 26